VI

THE Plaintiff's CHARGE DISPROV'D; And Turn'd upon Himself, BY THE DEFENDANT.

IN A

LETTER to the Author of *No just Grounds for introducing the New Communion Office*, &c.

Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself. *Rom.* ii. 1.

LONDON:

Printed for *James Bettenham*, at the *Crown* in *Pater-Noster Row*. MDCCXIX.

(Price 3*d*.)

THE

Plaintiff's CHARGE

DISPROV'D,

And Turn'd upon Himself;

BY THE

DEFENDANT.

IN A

LETTER to the Author of No 313 of the Craftsman, &c.

BRITISH MUSEUM

48
4. 8
931

BOOKS sold by JAM. BETTENHAM, at the *Crown* in *Pater-Noſter Row.*

REaſons for reſtoring ſome Prayers and Directions, as they ſtand in the Communion-Service of the firſt Engliſh Reform'd Liturgy, compil'd by the Biſhops in the 2d and 3d Years of the Reign of King Edward VI. *Price Six Pence.*

A Defence of the Reaſons for reſtoring ſome Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI's *firſt Liturgy: Being a Reply to a Book, entituled, No Reaſon for reſtoring them. Price one Shilling.*

A Vindication of the Reaſons and Defence, &c. Part I. Being a Reply to the firſt Part of No ſufficient Reaſon for reſtoring ſome Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI's *firſt Liturgy. By the Author of the Reaſons and Defence. Price Six Pence.*

A Vindication of the Reaſons and Defence, &c. Part II. Being a Reply to the Second Part of No Sufficient Reaſon for reſtoring ſome Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI's *firſt Liturgy. By the Author of the Reaſons and Defence. Price Two Shillings.*

BOOKS Sold by J. & R. BETTENHAM,
at the Crown in Pater-Noſter Row.

A

LETTER

To the AUTHOR of

No juſt Grounds for introducing the New Communion-Office, &c.

SIR,

WHEN an innocent Perſon is falſly accus'd, when the Accuſation affects the Cauſe of Religion, when not denying the Charge may be conſtru'd Guilt, and that ſuppos'd Guilt may be of ill Conſequence either to the Party accus'd, or to other Perſons; in ſuch a Caſe Juſtice requires an Anſwer to the Indictment, and Silence would be criminal. This Conſideration will, I hope, excuſe my Applying to you in this publick Manner in Vindication of myſelf from a Crime of a very heinous Nature, which you have been pleas'd to charge upon me in the 56th page of your late Book, entitled, *No juſt Grounds for introducing the New Communion-Office*, &c. It is no ſmall Concern to me, that I ſhould be accus'd of *Diſreſpecting the Scripture, and Preferring Tradition before it*; that I ſhould be tax'd in Print with *Setting aſide thoſe Sacred Records*, and diſregarding them as much as if *they had never been written*. This is an Offence of ſuch a Size and Conſequence, that could it be as plainly prov'd as it is publickly charg'd, I moſt freely confeſs, no Cenſure could be too rigid, no Puniſhment too ſevere to be inflicted upon me. But, God be thank'd, as my Conſcience acquits me; ſo the little Book, upon which you have

grounded your dreadful Accuſation, does entirely vindicate me from any ſuch dangerous Opinion. But it is not enough for me to plead Not Guilty; it is neceſſary I ſhould examine your Proofs, and produce ſome Arguments for my Innocence.

Your Charge and its Grounds I ſhall tranſcribe in your own Words. Speaking of me, you ſay: (a) "So "likewiſe a Friend of ours tells his Adverſary, he knew "*it was impoſſible for any one to ſhew, that the Church of* "Rome *was pure and ſound*; and gives this Reaſon of "ſuch his Complaint of her, that *ſhe had deviated from* "*Primitive Tradition, had made Additions of falſe Doc-* "*trines to the Creed, and had corrupted the Worſhip of the* "*Ancient Church*; and again, *ſhe has departed from the* "*Primitive Church, and deviated from Catholick Tradi-* "*tion, and therefore it is dangerous to be in her Communion.* "In neither of which Places is there any the leaſt Ap- "peal to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, nor any "more Mention made of them, than if they had never "been written. It may be, the Learned Doctor [*Brett*] "will ſay of this too, that it is no Diſreſpect to Scrip- "ture, and by no means a preferring Tradition be- "fore it. Though another would be tempted to look "upon it as a ſetting aſide thoſe Sacred Records, and "reſolving all into Tradition".

The Words you have quoted, I own to be mine: They ſtand in p. 139. and 142, 143. of a Book, entitled, *The Doctrine of the Church of* Rome *concerning Purgatory proved to be contrary to Catholick Tradition, and inconſiſtent with the neceſſary Duty of praying for the Dead, as practiſed in the Ancient Church.* But that they give any Ground for ſuch an Accuſation as you have charg'd upon me, is what I muſt beg Leave to deny.

For do not I in theſe very Paſſages appeal to *Primitive and* CATHOLICK TRADITION? And can you

(a) *No juſt Grounds*, &c. pag. 55, 56.

ſay,

ſay, this is excluding Scripture, and ſetting aſide thoſe Sacred Records? Do we not receive the Bible by Tradition? Can we be aſſur'd of its Divine Authority but by Tradition? Can we diſtinguiſh between Canonical and Apocryphal Books, between the genuine and ſpurious Writings of the Apoſtles, but by Tradition? Why then is appealing to Catholick Tradition, a *Diſreſpect to Scripture, and a Setting aſide thoſe Sacred Records?* I beg Leave to ask you, whether you do not believe in your Conſcience, that Scripture is included in Catholick Tradition? I may fairly preſume you think it is, for you yourſelf *have own'd* (b), *that we receive the Canon by Tradition.* Why then am I exclaim'd againſt as *reſolving all into Tradition*, when you found the Authority of the Bible upon it? And how can you anſwer charging me in ſo publick a Manner with *ſetting aſide thoſe Sacred Records*, when my very Words you quoted, do plainly include the Scriptures; nay, when you yourſelf have as good as confeſs'd the ſame in another Part of your Book?

But ſuppoſing the Words of mine you cited, did not imply the Scriptures, Did you know of no others in my little Book, in which the *Sacred Records* were expreſly mention'd, inſtead of being *ſet aſide?* And why were theſe conceal'd, *as if they had never been written?* Give me Leave to produce them in my own Vindication.

1. In my Title I quote a Text of Scripture, which does not look like *ſetting thoſe Sacred Records aſide.* The Text is what I wiſh ſome People would conſider and practiſe: *Prove all things*; **hold faſt** *that which is* **good.** 1 Theſſ. v. 21.

2. In my Preface, p. ii. I ſay, *a Writer of Controverſies of a religious Nature ſhould produce his Arguments from* **Scripture**, *Tradition, or Reaſon.*

(b) *No juſt Grounds, &c.* pag. 53.

3. In p. xvi. of the ſame Preface I urge in behalf of *Tradition*, that Scripture *recommends it.*

4. In p. 4. of the Book, I declare to my Adverſary the Romaniſt, that I take Scripture *and Tradition for a Rule of Faith*; and I profeſs *to believe nothing but what Jeſus Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, who have tranſmitted to us by* Scripture *and Tradition the whole Sum of our Belief.*

5. In p. 5. I have theſe Words, which are a full Anſwer to your whole Charge. *To* Scripture *and Tradition, to the* Bible *and the Catholick Church for four hundred Years after Chriſt, I appeal; by* them *will I be judg'd in all the Controverſies between us.*

6. In p. 138. ſpeaking of the Church of *Rome*'s declaring the whole Form of the Conſecration of the Euchariſt to be contain'd in the Words of Inſtitution, I ſay: *This Declaration, I muſt inſiſt upon it, is contrary both to* Scripture *and Primitive Tradition.*

7. In p. 142. the very Page from whence you have taken one of your Paſſages, I am ſo far from *ſetting aſide the Sacred Records*, that I expreſly mention them; for I challenge the *Romaniſt* to ſhew, that the Points we charge upon them as Corruptions (which I had mention'd before) *can be ſupported by* Scripture *or Catholick Tradition.*

And now, Sir, give me Leave to ask you ſeriouſly, why theſe Paſſages were not ſo much as hinted at? Why was I to be repreſented as *diſreſpecting the Scriptures, and ſetting aſide thoſe Sacred Records*, when I had expreſly appeal'd to them? If I muſt have been brought upon the Stage, tho' without any Occaſion, why was I dreſt ſo frightfully, and made ſo odious? Shall I call this Management, Impartiality, or Juſtice, or Charity?

Hard is it that a Chriſtian, and a Prieſt of the Catholick Church, ſhould be call'd upon to declare that he receives and reſpects the Scriptures. Yet this is my Caſe. I am falſly accus'd: And I am forc'd in my own Vindication to ſhew, that I do really believe

lieve and receive the Scriptures, and do not ſet them aſide. Your Accuſation went deep, and therefore requir'd the ſtronger Proof; but ſince I have ſhew'd, I hope, that it is deſtitute of any thing of that nature, and have demonſtrated my own Innocence in this Particular, you will eaſily imagine, Sir, that I can expect no leſs than that this publick Charge ſhould be retracted.

Having thus vindicated myſelf, give me Leave to enquire into the Occaſion of introducing me into your Book. The Paſſage which precedes your Accuſation, will ſufficiently explain it. You ſay (*c*), " the Doctor " exclaims loudly againſt the Anſwerer, for ſaying *the* " *Author of the Reaſons is for ſetting up Tradition as rather* " *to be attended to than Scripture.* And whether this be " not the true State of the Difference between them, " I referr to any unprejudic'd Perſon to determine. " It is leaving Scripture to ſet up Tradition, that is " the Matter of all our Debate; for why elſe are we " not ſuffer'd to ſtick to the plain Words of Scripture, " where they are ſo; or to thoſe Injunctions, which " our Saviour and his Apoſtles have left us, without " ſeeking to introduce other Duties by the Help of " Tradition, which neither our Saviour nor his Apo- " ſtles ſay a Word of? This ſure is not to preferr " Scripture to Tradition; yet this is manifeſtly what " the Author of the Defence pleads for from one End " of that Treatiſe to the other. So likewiſe, *&c.*" And then comes the Charge againſt me. As to this Controverſy concerning Scripture and Tradition, I ſhall not enter into the Merits of it; I leave that to the Gentlemen concern'd. What I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, is, that according to your Principles we ought to waſh one anothers Feet; and I ſhall make uſe of your own Words to prove, that the Fact you charge upon us,

(c *No juſt Grounds*, &c. pag. 55.

you are guilty of yourſelf; and that your Opinion and Arguments will furniſh this Concluſion, that you *leave Scripture, and ſet up Tradition as rather to be attended to.*

In order to this, give me Leave to ſuppoſe, there was a Sect in the World, which practis'd the Cuſtom of waſhing one another's Feet, and thought it neceſſary; let us ſee whether your Principles and Arguments will not prove the Neceſſity of that Cuſtom, and condemn all Churches which do not practiſe it.

A DIALOGUE

Between a CATHOLICK and a SECTARIAN.

Cath. SIR, I underſtand you are of a Sect, which practiſes the Cuſtom of waſhing one another's Feet, and thinks it neceſſary. Pray give me an Account what you ground this Opinion and Practice upon?

Sect. Ground it, Sir? Why, upon the Scriptures, upon the plain expreſs Words of Jeſus Chriſt. I ſuppoſe you have read what the Evangeliſt tells us in the following Words (*d*). *Jeſus riſeth from Supper, and laid aſide his Garments, and took a Towel and girded himſelf. After that, he poureth Water into a Baſon, and began to waſh the Diſciples Feet, and to wipe them with the Towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to* Simon Peter: *And* Peter *ſaith unto him, Lord, doſt thou waſh my Feet? Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto him, What I do thou knoweſt not now, but thou ſhalt know hereafter.* Peter *ſaith unto him, Thou ſhalt never waſh my Feet. Jeſus anſwered him, If I waſh*

(d) *John* xiii. 4, —— 17.

thee

thee not, thou haſt no Part with me. Simon Peter *ſaith unto him, Lord, not my Feet only, but alſo my Hands and my Head. Jeſus ſaith to him, He that is waſhed, needeth not, ſave to waſh his Feet, but is clean every whit: —— So after he had waſhed their Feet, and had taken his Garments, and was ſet down again, he ſaid unto them, Know you what I have done to you? Ye call me Maſter, and Lord: And ye ſay well; for ſo I am. If I then your Lord and Maſter have waſhed your Feet, ye alſo ought to waſh one anothers Feet. For I have given you an Example, that ye ſhould do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, The Servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is ſent greater than he that ſent him. If ye know theſe things, happy are ye if ye do them.*

Cath. I remember all this very well.

Sect. Sir, I was willing to repeat ſo much, that you might ſee the whole Inſtitution of this Duty. Don't you obſerve, that our Saviour ſaid to his Diſciples, *Ye ought to waſh one anothers Feet: For I have given you an Example, that* **Ye ſhould do as I have done to you**? Is not the Scripture expreſs for us?

Cath. But this Cuſtom was not practis'd by the Catholick Church, and Tradition ſhews that it is not neceſſary.

Sect. Sir, I deſire you would conſider, that " (*e*) " Scripture, and not Tradition, is preſcribed by our Sa- " viour to his Diſciples, as the Rule for them to walk " by, and which we are all neceſſarily to adhere to, for " the Guidance of our Faith and Worſhip, and our Be- " haviour in all Reſpects. *To the Law and to the Teſti-* " *mony,* ſays the Prophet *Iſaiah, if they ſpeak not accord-* " *ing to this Word, it is becauſe there is no Light in them.* " Iſ. viii. 20. And again, *Seek ye out of the Book of the* " *Lord, and read,* ch. xxxiv. 16. And ſo in the New " Teſtament, *Search the Scriptures,* ſays our Saviour.

(e) *No Sufficient Reaſon, &c.* Part I. pag. 2, 3.

" S. *John* v. 39. And in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, ch. " xvii. 11. the *Jews* at *Beraa* are commended as *more* " *Noble*, of a milder and better Temper and Diſpoſition, " than thoſe at *Theſſalonica*, and for this Reaſon, *becauſe* " *they received the Word with all Readineſs of Mind, and* " *ſearched the Scriptures daily.* And indeed, that not Tra- " dition, but Scripture, is the Rule for our Direction, " is a Doctrine ſo agreeable to our moſt Holy Profeſ- " ſion, and has been ſo fully proved from time to time, " that whenſoever any Competition ariſes between " them, I thought there was no Room for doubting, " whether of them were chiefly to be relied upon. —— " (*f*) S. *Paul* teaches that the Church is *built upon the A-* " *poſtles and Prophets*, and eſpecially upon our Bleſſed " Lord and Saviour, as its *chief Corner-Stone*, and not the " Apoſtles and Prophets, and our Lord himſelf, upon " the Church. Our Saviour confuted the *Sadducees* " from Scripture, S. *Matth.* xxii. 32. S. *Paul* confuted " the falſe Apoſtles from Scripture, *Gal.* iii. 10. The " Fathers in their Diſputations with Hereticks, appealed " to Scripture. But now we are taught to betake our- " ſelves not to Scripture, but Tradition and the Fa- " thers; which though of uſe in their proper Place, " yet are by no means to be compared with Scripture, " or ſet in Oppoſition to it.

Cath. " (*g*) But Scripture and Tradition are two " Conveyances not oppoſite and deſtructive of each " other: They are no more than different Ways of " publiſhing the Will of God, and only two Streams " flowing from the ſame Fountain.

Sect. " (*h*) But now if they happen in ſome Inſtances " to teach contrary Doctrines, [as in the Caſe of waſh- " ing one anothers Feet;] if our Saviour teach one " thing, and Tradition is cited for another of a diffe-

---

(f) *Id.* pag. 3. (g) *Defence, &c.* pag. 18. (h) *No Sufficient Reaſon, &c.* Part I. pag. 25.

" rent

" rent Nature, [for a quite contrary thing] what can " hinder their being in this Case *opposite and destructive* " *of each other?*" What if the Scripture say we ought to wash one anothers Feet, can an After-Tradition dispense with all Christians from performing that necessary Duty? " *(i)* And if it can, is not here some Opposi- " tion between them, and such as is destructive of the " Directions given us to stick to Scripture, as of itself " sufficient *(k)* to lead us to Salvation. *(l)* This shews, " that Scripture and Tradition are not always agreed " upon, for conveying the same Truth, but may be *op-* " *posite and destructive to each other.* And when this hap- " pens, I do not meet with any Proof, that the latter " Way of Conveyance is most authenthick, and rather " to be relied upon than Scripture.

Cath. But the Scripture cannot prove itself; and don't you receive the Bible by Tradition?

Sect. " *(m)* I own that we receive the Canon by Tra- " dition: And yet there is a great deal in Scripture to " prove Scripture, though not enough to prove it all, " or distinguish the Canonical Books from those that " are Apocryphal. For this we must depend upon those " who made the Distinction, and settled the Canon, and " upon others that have transmitted it down to us, as " being the completest and best Evidence the Nature " of the thing is capable of; than which no reasonable " Man would in any Case desire more. But if you " would inferr from hence, that because Tradition is " to be relied upon, where it is the best Evidence that " can be had, therefore it is to be made our Rule in all " Cases, and we must not so much as pretend to inter- " pret a plain easy Text of Scripture, without Re- " course had to Tradition for its right and sometimes " for its wrong Sense, as it often happens, you cannot

---

(i) *Ibid.* (k) 2 *Tim.* iii. 16, 17. (l) *No Sufficient Reason, &c.* Part I. p. 26. (m) *No just Grounds, &c.* pag. 53.

expect

" expect this will be granted you, without much better " Authority than ever you are like to bring for it.

Cath. But is not Tradition the beſt Comment upon Scripture?

Sect. I grant you, " (*n*) Tradition is the beſt Aſſi- " ſtant to Scripture, to explain the Senſe of it in ob- " ſcure and difficult Places; but that any the plaineſt " and eaſieſt Texts of Scripture, ſuch as that, *I will* " *drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine, &c.* or that other, " *Do this in remembrance of me,* [or that, *Ye ought to waſh* " *one anothers Feet*] or others of the like nature, are " not to be underſtood according to their plain literal " Senſe, but Tradition muſt be haled in to put a fo- " reign Interpretation upon them;" here I muſt crave Leave to differ from you. " (*o*) Let Tradition be " brought in reality in Defence of Scripture, or for " Explication of any obſcure Part of it, and it will be " long enough before I ſhall appear againſt any ſuch " Defence or Explication. Only I cannot think it " right to pay a greater Deference to Tradition than " Scripture, when at any time they do not well conſiſt " together." And in the Caſe we are diſputing upon, *Ye* ought *to waſh one anothers Feet. For I have given you an Example, that* ye ſhould do as I have done to you: Theſe " (*p*) Words of our Bleſſed Saviour are plain and " clear, and need no Expoſitor to make them intelligi- " ble. (*q*) And how do you prove the Scripture is " not clear in this Point, or needs any Tradition to " interpret it?

Cath. Tho' the Senſe may ſeem clear; yet ſince we live at ſo great a Diſtance from the Age when the Scriptures were written, we cannot determine upon this Point of waſhing one anothers Feet, nor know and underſtand this Matter thoroughly but by Tradition.

(n) *Id.* p. 9. (o) *Id.* p. 13. (p) *Id.* p. 58. (q) *Id.* p. 59.

Sect.

Sect. " (*r*) It is ſtrange you ſhould talk thus of this " Thing, as not being knowable but by Tradition, " when every one ſees it is related in the Holy Scrip- " tures plainly and beyond all Contradiction. (*s*) Nor " can ſuch cauſleſs Reflexions upon Scripture, as not " intelligible at this diſtance of Time from the Wri- " ting of it, ſerve to any other purpoſe, than to unſet- " tle Peoples Minds, and fill their Heads with Doubts " and Perplexities, leſt they ſhould never be able to " underſtand what the plain Words of Scripture " mean. Eſpecially if they be ſuch as are not at Liber- " ty to ſpend all their Time in making a thorough " ſearch into Antiquity, to learn from thence what " they may not be ſuppoſed able to learn from the " Word of God. " But I find you are of Opinion, (*t*) that we live at too great a diſtance " from the Age " in which the Scriptures were written, to know what " Duties are taught by them, and muſt have recourſe " therefore to Tradition, to learn what they were de- " ſign'd to teach us, and to pick up a good Part of our " Duty only from thence. As if Chriſtianity were " a Religion intended only for the learned Part of the " World, and none muſt hope to know, even ſo much " as what is of neceſſity to Salvation, unleſs ſuch as " have time enough to ſpare, and are willing to ſpend " the chief Part of their Days, or perhaps the Whole " of them, in finding out what they ought to have made " it the great Buſineſs of their Lives to practiſe.

Cath. I find then you are for rejecting Tradition.

Sect. Not at all. I own we receive the Scripture by Tradition; and that it is the beſt Aſſiſtant to Scripture, to explain the Senſe of it in obſcure and difficult Places: But in thoſe which are plainly expreſs and clear, I think there Tradition ought to yield to Scripture. But I find, you are " (*u*) for ſetting up Tradition as of equal

---

(r) *Id.* p. 33. (s) *Id.* p. 32. (t) *Id.* p. 34 (u) *Id.* ibid.

Obligation

" Obligation to Scripture; and you teach, that in Mat-
" ters of Diſpute, [as this of waſhing one anothers
" Feet] we are to recurr, not to the Holy Scriptures,
" how deciſive ſoever, but to the Apoſtolical Churches,
" or Records of the Primitive Writers, the Conſent of
" Chriſtendom being, according to you, equivalent to
" a Scripture Command. As if the ſacred Writers,
" Inſpired and Directed by the Holy Ghoſt, either
" could not or would not teach us our Duty, in that
" Code of Chriſtian Laws, which was left us on pur-
" poſe to make us *wiſe unto Salvation*, and perfect the
" Man of God, and furniſh him to every good Work."
Pray what do you think of the Scriptures?

Cath. What? Why, I think they are inſpired Writings, and that every Word in them is to be believ'd and obey'd.

Sect. (*w*) This is indeed your Profeſſion, but it is
" plain [by your not waſhing one anothers Feet] that
" not Scripture, but the ancient Church, that is to ſay
" Tradition, is the Rule you depend upon. (*x*) You
" profeſs to be guided by Scripture. But then pray
" don't let People miſtake you, for you mean no ſuch
" Thing. It is Tradition you are guided by; which
" becauſe you are unwilling to own the true State of
" the Caſe, you ſometimes call *Scripture interpreted by*
" *the Ancient Church*; hereby plainly intimating, that
" it is not Scripture by which you are guided, but the
" ſuppoſed Interpretation of the *Ancient Church*, tho'
" ſometimes quite beſides, and at others evidently ir-
" reconcilable to the Doctrines of the holy Scriptures.

Cath. Pray, Sir, what do you ſay of Tradition? Do you condemn it?

Sect. I ſay, that " (*y*) Tradition ought by no means
" to interfere with Scripture, [as it does in this Caſe
" of waſhing one anothers Feet.] I ſay, that (*z*) " no

(w) *Id.* p. 10. (x) *Id.* ibid. (y) *Id.* p. 4. (z) *Id.* p. 19.

Tradi-

" Tradition is to be received, that is not evidently " conſiſtent with Scripture. *(a)* I aſſure you, I am " no more for condemning Tradition than you, only " I would not have it advanced to ſuch a Height, as " that we may not pretend to underſtand the plain and " unqueſtionable Words of Scripture without it. *(b)* " I am not for ſetting Scripture and Tradition at Vari- " ance, but for uſing both as occaſion offers; only I " am for aſcribing to each its proper Office, and not " making Scripture truckle to Tradition, if any diffe- " rence unhappily ariſe between them. It is true, I " am not for impoſing foreign Senſes upon the plain " Doctrines of Scripture, ſuch as the Words will not " by any fair Conſtruction be brought to bear;— *(c)* " My aim is only to follow the Direction of Scripture, " where the Words of it are plain and eaſily intelligi- " ble." But you are for ſetting up Tradition as ra- " ther to be attended to than Scripture.

Cath. Indeed you do me a great deal of Wrong by miſrepreſenting me thus.

Sect. " *(d)* You may exclaim as loudly as you pleaſe. " But whether this be not the true State of the Diffe- " rence between us, I referr to any unprejudiced Perſon " to determine. It is leaving Scripture to ſet up Tra- " dition, that is the Matter of all our Debate; for why " elſe are we not ſuffer'd to ſtick to the plain Words of " Scripture where they are ſo? [*Ye ought to waſh one ano-* " *thers Feet.*] *(e)* If carrying People off from the plain " Words of Scripture, upon pretence of a Tradition to " the contrary, be not to make Scripture ſtoop to Tra- " dition; I muſt come to you to know what is." Do not you in this Caſe of waſhing one anothers Feet "*(f)* plead " Tradition in oppoſition to the plain Words of Scrip- " ture, I mean for interpreting quite away the moſt " genuine, the natural, and literal Senſe of them? *(g)*

(a) *Id.* p. 21 (b) *Id.* p. 54. (c) *Id.* p. 55. (d) *Id.* ibid. (e) *Id.* p. 56. (f) *Id.* p. 56. (g) *Id.* p. 60.

" And

" And does not this repreſent Tradition, as an Au-
" thority obliging us to what we are not obliged to by
" the Holy Scriptures; " or diſpenſing with us where we are obliged to performance by thoſe ſacred Records?

Cath. Well, I am for Scripture and Tradition. Whatever appears to me to be prov'd by Tradition, I believe; becauſe I believe the Bible upon that ground.

Sect. Sir, pray remember what I ſaid before: That Scripture, and not Tradition, is preſcrib'd by our Saviour to his Diſciples, as the Rule for them to walk by: That tho' Tradition is the beſt Aſſiſtant to Scripture, to explain the Senſe of it in obſcure and difficult Places, yet we are not to make uſe of it to interpret quite away the moſt genuine, the natural and literal Senſe of them; for that would be pleading Tradition in oppoſition to the plain Words of Scripture; and no Tradition is to be receiv'd, which is not evidently conſiſtent with Scripture. By theſe poſitions we vindicate the Practice of waſhing one anothers Feet, and ſhew the Neceſſity of it from our Saviour's plain expreſs command.

Cath. I cannot but think, that the Chriſtians in all ages and places underſtood their Duty as well as you.

Sect. As to their underſtanding, I ſhall not concern myſelf about it. I can read the plain expreſs words of Scripture, as well as they could. I can eaſily ſee the meaning of, *I will drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine, Do this in Remembrance of me, Ye ought to waſh one anothers Feet.* You ask'd me the Grounds we went upon in this opinion and practice of ours, which I have given you. And ſo, Sir, your Servant.

Cath. Sir, Yours.

I do not know, Sir, that I have any where in this dialogue miſrepreſented your words or arguments. And I cannot but think that from your Principles, and what you have ſaid concerning Tradition, it plainly follows that we ought to waſh one anothers Feet; or that you who do not practiſe that Cuſtom, leave Scripture, and

ſe

ſet up Tradition as rather to be attended to; or elſe that the heavy charge you have laid againſt us, is not juſt, and conſequently ought to be retracted.

There is one Argument beſides, which might be urg'd in behalf of waſhing one anothers Feet, which cannot be pleaded by you in Defence of the Practice of uſing Wine alone in the Euchariſtick Cup: And that is, that the Cuſtom of waſhing the Feet was practis'd by (*h*) ſome Catholick Chriſtians; whereas the Way of adminiſtring the Sacrament which you argue for, was never obſerv'd by any Part of the Catholick Church. And you muſt pardon me, when I beg Leave to call upon you for one Inſtance of any Catholick Biſhop or Prieſt, who ever conſecrated or receiv'd the Sacramental Cup without Water in it. And I cannot help thinking it no ſmall Diſadvantage to your Euchariſt, that it differs in the Matter of it from that Sacrament, which was receiv'd by all Catholick Chriſtians for above 1500 Years together.

Your whole Dependence ſeems to be upon this Expreſſion, *the Fruit of the Vine*. But if this be taken in your own Senſe, here is no Diſproof of our Bleſſed Saviour's uſing Water, when he inſtituted the Euchariſtick Cup. For, as has been (*i*) already urg'd, when Moſes ſprinkled the People with the (*k*) Blood of the Covenant, there is no mention of Water being mix'd with it: And yet the (*l*) Apoſtle aſſures us, that *Moſes* took the Blood with Water. Beſides, that *the Fruit of the Vine* ſignifies Wine and Water among the *Hebrews*, has been prov'd (*m*.) That the (*n*) *Greeks* call Wine and Water by the Name of Wine, has been likewiſe ſhewn. And for our own

(h) *See Concil.* Eliberit. Can. 48. *S.* Ambroſe *de Initiatis*, cap. 6. *and the Treatiſe* de Sacramentis, *which goes under his Name*, lib. 3. cap. 1. (i) *Reaſons, &c.* pag. 9. (k) *Exod.* xxiv. ver. 6, 8. (l) *Hebr.* ix. 19. (m) See, *Reaſons, Defence, Vindication* Part I. *The Neceſſity of an Alteration.* (n) *Reaſons, &c.* p. 10. Τὸ κεῖμα, καί τοι πλείονος μετέχον ὕδατος, οἶνον καλοῦμεν. Plutarch. *Oper.* Tom. 2. pag. 140. f. Edit. Francofurti 1599.

Engliſh

Engliſh Language, I beg you will recollect, that in the firſt Reform'd Liturgy of King *Edward* VI. the Prieſt in the Prayer of Conſecration calls the Euchariſtick Elements nothing but *Bread and Wine*, tho' in a foregoing Rubrick the Wine is expreſly order'd to be mix'd with Water.

In ſhort, Sir, that our Bleſſed Saviour us'd Wine and Water at the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, has been clearly made out; nor can it be deny'd without ſetting aſide the Evidence, upon which the Scripture is founded. You yourſelf have never ſaid he us'd Wine alone, nor have you deny'd his Practiſing the Mixture. Now thoſe Elements which our Lord made uſe of at the Inſtitution, he ordain'd to be the Matter of the Sacrament, and commanded his Apoſtles and the Church to practiſe after his Example: *Do this in Remembrance of me.* Conſequently, when we uſe Wine and Water we are ſure we are right: You cannot ſay we deviate from Chriſt's Inſtitution. But how terrible the Conſequence may be of omitting Part of our Redeemer's Cup, is what I dare not determine. I know very well, in Temporal Matters we take care to act otherwiſe: There we always proceed upon ſure Grounds. And why we ſhould be leſs careful in a Matter of ſo great Importance as the Sacrament, is what I am not able to account for.

But my Buſineſs is not to enlarge upon this Subject: I only deſign'd to vindicate myſelf from the dreadful Accuſation of diſreſpecting the Scriptures, and ſetting aſide thoſe Sacred Records; which I have done, and have ſhew'd that the Crime you charg'd upon us, you are really, according to your own Principles, guilty of yourſelf. I pray, God grant us Truth and Peace; and I am,

SIR,

Good Friday,
1719.

Your moſt humble Servant,

THOMAS DEACON.

BRITISH MUSEUM